

3
istration asks for additional grant money to help construct educational radio and television facilities, boosting this program from \$3.3 million to \$10.5 million.

While the President makes clear he is not thinking of a fourth network along the lines of Comsat (the new corporation is not to sell its stock to the public), he does not settle the tricky political question of how a public network is to be financed. In its recent report, the Carnegie Commission recommended that funds come in part from private sources, and from an excise tax levied on television sets. By contrast, the Ford Foundation had earlier proposed that some of the income from television satellite transmission be used to finance a public network. In effect, the Carnegie Commission proposes taxing the consumer, and the Ford Foundation taxing the television business. It seems to us that the underwriting of a fourth network ought to come from the television networks, as partial payment for their right to profit from public frequencies.

Running the Capital

The taxed but mute citizens of the nation's capital are no closer to having a voice in managing their hometown than they were in 1874, when Congress decided to take control of local affairs. Effective power over the District has ever since been held by the House District Committee, whose comprehension of or sympathy with urban problems is at best marginal. What leadership could John L. McMillan of Florence, S. C. (he became chairman of the committee in 1946) or Thomas G. Abernethy of Okalona, Mississippi (its second-ranking member whose committee service dates from 1943), provide a metropolis 91 percent of whose public school children are Negro, where more children drop out of public high school than graduate, and in which the homicide rate has doubled since 1960?

Again last week, the President reminded Congress that its 535 members "should not be expected to serve as city councilmen for the city of Washington." Since he could expect no more favorable reception this year for his plea than in previous years, Mr. Johnson accompanied his message by an announcement. Using authority given him by the Reorganization Act, he will, on his own, and as an interim measure, "make the present unwieldy structure into an efficient and effective instrument of municipal government." He plans to replace the existing three-man board of District commissioners, each of whom has run an independent principality, by a single executive who will preside over a presidentially appointed city council of nine members having two-year terms. The "mayor" would serve at the pleasure of the President, permitting the White House to have its own man and permitting

the "mayor" to use that relationship to get things done. The reorganization becomes effective in 60 days - unless the Congress chooses to veto it.

Pending adoption of a constitutional amendment (which the President recommends) which would allow the District voting representatives in Congress, Mr. Johnson asks that Washingtonians have the right to elect one nonvoting delegate in the House. It's a modest request, and a good one.

Clarification

Our lead note of last week (*Playing It Straight*) did not get two things altogether straight. We reported that Mr. Frank Sieverts, a former regional officer of the NSA, had been appointed to direct the Katzenbach staff investigating CIA, that Mr. Sieverts keeps tabs on NSA for State and had attended the student group's annual Congress as a lobbyist for the Administration's position on Vietnam. Mr. Sieverts informs us that he "was asked to attend the NSA congress last summer to share a platform with Bernard Fall (whose untimely death I join you in mourning), and to participate in a roundtable discussion on Vietnam. I was there briefly, solely for these two public talks, not, as you would have it, 'in the dual role of students' pal and government's link.' Nor do I 'keep tabs on the organization for State.' Nothing like this has ever been part of my work at the State Department. I was totally unaware that CIA was funding NSA activities until I read it in the newspapers. Finally, I am not involved in the inquiry headed by Undersecretary Katzenbach, and most emphatically am not 'directing the investigators' staff'."

Concerning the MIT Press, its director has told us that it "has never 'used CIA money to publish studies' in any field." The imprint of the Press, he says, "is reserved for those scholarly or educative works which in the estimate of scholarly or academic critics at MIT or at other institutions lend substantive contributions or utility to a specific inquiry. The substance of each manuscript, along with such critical evaluation, is considered by an MIT faculty board, and only those works approved by this board are published by the MIT Press. Over the years, MIT Center for International Studies [which has received CIA funds - *The Editors*] has produced more than 100 books of which the MIT Press has been proud to publish 26. These books have been accepted for publication by the same process and on the same critical basis as all our other publications. To infer that any funding agency, government or otherwise, has dictated the selection of titles published by this, or any other, university press, confuses the support of research with the privilege of publication."